‘They recited the Ten Commandments, the Shema’, the sections "And it shall come to pass if ye diligently hearken", and "And the Lord said", "True and firm", the ‘Abodah, and the priestly benediction’. Rab Judah said in the name of Samuel: Outside the Temple also people wanted to do the same,[2] but they were stopped on account of the insinuations of the Minim.[3] Similarly it has been taught: R. Nathan says, They sought to do the same outside the Temple,[4] but it had long been abolished on account of the insinuations of the Minim. Rabbah b. Bar Hanah[5] had an idea of instituting this in Sura,[6] but R. Hisda said to him, It had long been abolished on account of the insinuations of the Minim. Amemar had an idea of instituting it in Nehardea, but R. Ashi said to him, It had long been abolished on account of the insinuations of the Minim.

‘On Sabbath they said an additional blessing on account of the outgoing watch’. What was this benediction? — R. Helbo said: The outgoing watch said to the incoming one, May He who has caused His name to dwell in this house cause to dwell among you love and brotherhood and peace and friendship.

WHERE THEY ORDAINED THAT A LONG BENEDICTION SHOULD BE SAID. There is no question that where a man took up a cup of wine thinking that it was beer and commenced [with the intention to say the benediction] for beer but finished with that of wine, he has fulfilled his obligation. For even had he said the benediction, ‘By whose word all things exist’,[7] he would have fulfilled his duty, as we have learnt: ‘In the case of all of them,[8] if he says, "By whose word all things exist", he has performed his obligation’.[9] But where he took up a cup of beer thinking it was wine and began [with the intention to say the benediction] for wine and finished with the benediction for beer, the question arises, do we judge his benediction according to its beginning or according to its ending? — Come and hear: ‘In the morning, if one commenced with [the intention to say] "Who formest light" and finished with "Who bringest on the evening twilight",[10] he has not performed his obligation; if he commences [with the intention to say] "Who bringest on the evening twilight" and finished with Who formest the light", he has performed his obligation. In the evening, if one commenced [with the intention to say] "Who bringest on the evening twilight" and finished with "Who formest the light", he has not performed his obligation; if he begins with [the intention to say] "Who formest the light" and closes with "Who bringest on the evening twilight", he has performed his obligation. The principle is that the final form is decisive’. — It is different there because [at the end] he says, ‘Blessed art Thou who formest the luminaries’.[11] This would be a good argument for Rab who said that any blessing that does not contain the mention of God's name is no blessing.[12] But if we accept the view of R. Johanan who said that any blessing that does not contain a mention of the divine kingship is no blessing, what can be said?[13] Rather [we must reply]: Since Rabbah b. ‘Ulla has said: So as to mention the distinctive quality of the day in the night-time and the distinctive feature of the night in the day-time,[14] [we may assume that] when he said a blessing [with the divine name] and with the kingship[15] in the beginning, he refers to both of them.[16]

Come and hear from the concluding clause: ‘The principle is that the final form is decisive’. What further case is included by the words ‘the principle is’? Is it not the one we have mentioned?[17] — No; it is to include bread and dates. How are we to understand this? Shall I say that he ate bread thinking that he was eating dates,[18] and commenced [with the intention of saying the benediction] for dates and finished [with the blessing for] bread? This is just the same thing! — No, this is required [for the case where] he ate dates thinking that he was eating bread, and he began with [the intention to say the blessing] for bread and finished with that of dates. In this case he has fulfilled his obligation; for even if he had concluded with the blessing for bread, he would also have fulfilled it. What is the reason? — Because dates also give sustenance.[19]

Raba b. Hinena the elder said in the name of Rab: If one omits to say True and firm’[20] in the morning and ‘True and trustworthy’[21] in the evening, he has not performed his obligation; for it is said, To declare Thy lovingkindness in the morning and Thy faithfulness in the night seasons.[22]